

a chance they could rule with the full faith and credit, but also the equal protection clause. Either one of those imposes same sex marriage on all the States, even though a vast majority of the States have passed marriage protection language, either in their constitutions or statutorily; and some of them have done both.

But a different way of thinking about this too is the argument is made that marriage is a civil right; therefore, you could not deny it to consenting adults.

I want to argue that marriage is not a civil right. It is not a civil right for a man and a woman, it is not a civil right for two consenting adults, and, in fact, it is not a right whatsoever. It is a privilege.

The reason I declare marriage to be a privilege is because we grant a marriage license. A license is something that gives you a permit. It is a permit to do that which is otherwise illegal.

So we grant a marriage license, or we grant a license to drive a car or to fish or hunt or whatever it might be, because we want to promote a certain kind of behavior and we want to regulate a certain kind of behavior. And certainly it is discriminatory in favor of those activities that we license.

So for the same reason, we grant a marriage license, a permit to do that which is otherwise illegal. It is not discriminatory, except that it is constructive because this cornerstone of civilization has been proven since the beginning of time to be the very element, that cornerstone of civilization through which we procreate, we pass along our religious values, our moral values, our work ethic, our very culture and civilization, all of the things that come through the marriage.

The children learn from a father and a mother. Say, for example, a little boy falls down and skins his knee, and he runs to his mom and she says, Come here, honey. I will kiss it and make it better. That is a mom's role in a case like that.

□ 2100

And the father says, oh, come on, son, you are going to have to be a man one day. You are going to have to tough this one out. That is the other message. They are not really conflicting messages; they are messages that need to come from the ideal circumstances between a man and a woman in holy matrimony.

Madam Speaker, so much of our history, so much of our culture, and so much of our civilization and our respect for our ancestors flows through marriage, and we know the things we learn there, because we revere our ancestors, we also want to be worthy of that respect from our descendants. Those values are taught through marriage, through the family, through the ideal way of raising children as a man and woman in the home, and that is the point I think is important to make, and I would be happy to conclude and yield back to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. A couple more questions. People ask, is it fair? What about benefits? Are gay couples, if they cannot marry, denied benefits? If medical proxies are not working, let us fix that problem. If people need health care, let us fix that problem, but let us not mess with marriage.

Marriage is about children and it is about the best institution for raising children, and that is the issue. Kids are better off with a mother and father. The issue is not whether gays can be good parents or not; no one is talking about that. We are saying that children are generally better off with a loving mother and a loving father; and that is the role, that is the method, that is the paradigm that works best.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the people who have helped me present this case to this body.

#### IMPORTANT STRATEGIES FOR FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about what I believe to be the most difficult and the most important issue facing this Congress, a Congress that has the responsibility under the Constitution to provide for the common defense, and that problem is the threat of international terrorism.

It has been over 3 years now since the horrific attacks against our Nation occurred on September 11. Our world has changed in many respects since then. We know that we are engaged in a global war against terrorism. New security measures have been put in place at our ports, along our borders, and even along the roads leading to our Nation's capital. We know now that the circumstances in Arab and Muslim countries on the other side of the globe can affect the safety and security of all Americans right here at home.

With our national elections less than 5 weeks away, the American people are asking whether we are truly winning this war against our terrorist enemies. They want to know whether this government is taking the steps necessary to ensure that we are as safe as we need to be.

The members of the Select Committee on Homeland Security have been studying this issue closely for almost 2 years. We have visited our ports and our borders. We have heard testimony from hundreds of government officials and expert witnesses, and we have met with law enforcement and security professionals in our congressional districts. My colleagues and I are here tonight to say that, no, we are not as safe as we need to be. We say this reluctantly and regretfully, but it is our constitutional duty to be honest

with our constituents and to tell the Nation how it really is.

Despite the rhetoric that we hear so often from this administration, the truth is that our government has not taken the steps necessary to provide genuine security from the threat of terrorism, and whether or not we are winning the war on terror has yet to be determined.

Indeed, 2 months ago, the 9/11 Commission, a bipartisan group appointed by this Congress in very important legislation, they drew the same conclusion that we draw tonight. That bipartisan report identified severe defects in the administration's policies to counteract terrorism, many of which were well-known years ago, but have not been adequately addressed. Indeed, the bipartisan 9/11 Commission Report and its recommendations are an indictment of this administration's efforts over the past 3 years to secure the homeland and to defeat our terrorist enemies.

The 9/11 Commission concluded, as we did in our report called "Winning the War on Terror," that we must engage on three fronts simultaneously. First, we need a more aggressive strategy to attack the terrorists directly by using our military and our other national security agencies wisely and cutting off the terrorists' source of funds. Such an aggressive strategy should ensure that we strengthen our intelligence capabilities to penetrate terrorist organizations and ensure that we translate and analyze all of the intelligence information that we collect in real-time.

Yesterday, the New York Times revealed in an article that the Justice Department's own Inspector General has determined that nearly a quarter of all ongoing FBI counterterrorism and counterintelligence wiretaps are not being monitored and that nearly 120,000 hours of wiretap recordings from terrorist investigations since September 11 have not even been translated.

This is unacceptable. This is the same problem that we had before 9/11. It was one of the key reasons that 9/11 occurred. If we are serious in our efforts to attack the terrorists, we must take full advantage of the information that is collected by our intelligence agencies. And to learn that 3 years after 9/11, our government has yet to get itself in a position to be able to translate the intelligence that we are collecting, to be able to have the linguists available to make those translations occur rapidly is totally unacceptable.

Additionally, we need to increase our special forces in our military to more aggressively attack our terrorist enemies. We must create greater numbers of small and light forces that have proved so successful in hunting down terrorist cells, and we must dry up the sources of funds for the terrorists and for their organizations. We must lead an effort to establish international financial standards to halt money laundering and to help other countries

crack down on individuals and organizations who provide money to terrorist groups.

One may rightfully ask, why has this administration not done these things some 3 years after 9/11? The gap between the rhetoric on protecting the homeland and the reality of protecting the homeland is indeed very great.

In addition to attacking the terrorists directly, we need to protect our homeland by constructing and strengthening the layers of protective measures overseas, at our borders, at our airports, our seaports, and our critical infrastructures like the nuclear and chemical plants that are targeted by our terrorist enemies.

As an example, we must commit the necessary resources and take constructive steps with our allies to ensure that our dangerous nuclear and radiological materials are safe and secure overseas and do not threaten us here at home. We must ensure that we install the radiation portal detectors at our ports to ensure that a weapon of mass destruction cannot be shipped into our country on an 18-wheeler or in a cargo container coming off a ship at one of our seaports.

It is unacceptable that 3 years after 9/11 we still have not installed sufficient radiation portal detectors to know that this country is safe from our terrorist enemies bringing a nuclear bomb or a radiological device into our country. We must move much faster to protect our borders, to protect our ports, to secure our airports, our airplanes, and improve the capabilities of our Nation's first responders; and we must ensure that we can protect our citizens from the threat of bioterrorism, one of the most serious threats that we face today and increasingly will face in the years ahead.

As we aggressively fight our terrorist enemies, as we work to improve our homeland security, we must also engage in the third prong of making America safe as recommended by the 9/11 Commission. We must create a political, a social, and an economic strategy for this country to engage the Arab and Muslim nations to prevent the rise of future terrorists. Many observers who have looked closely at the war on terror acknowledge very freely that we cannot win the war on terror with military power alone. It will take all the tools in our national arsenal to defeat al Qaeda and our terrorist enemies.

It is clear that we cannot coexist with our terrorist enemies. We cannot bridge over our differences with al Qaeda, but we must be aware of the nature of the current ideological struggle that is going on and is very much a part of the war on terror. We must know our enemies, we must understand what motivates them, and then we must support initiatives to rob them of that support.

To prevent the rise of future terrorists, we must first pursue policies that promote and support the voices of moderation in the Middle East and offer an

alternative vision of hope for the millions of people, particularly young people, who today are appealed to by the message of bin Laden and al Qaeda.

Secondly, we must promote and support democratic institutions and practices worldwide, making it possible for democracy to rise in those places in the world where it does not currently exist. We must have the wisdom to recognize that democracy cannot be forced upon others; but it must be the result of people willingly, freely choosing liberty for themselves. We must launch an economic development partnership in the Arab and Muslim world that is in the spirit of the Marshall Plan that followed the Second World War. I would call this effort a renaissance partnership, for it would lead to a rebirth of prosperity and a new spirit of openness and tolerance in the Middle East. People without hope, people without the chance for a better way of life, they are the ones who respond to the ideology and to the message of the terrorists. We can change the world, but we must do so by engaging the world, by uniting with our allies in the rich Arab States to improve the conditions of the Muslim and Arab world.

All three of these tasks, going after the terrorists more aggressively, securing the homeland better than we are doing today, and preventing the rise of future terrorists, must be the principal focus of our national efforts to win the war on terror. Unfortunately, we do not have a comprehensive strategy in place today to deal with these elements in the war on terror, and that is why today we are not as safe as we need to be.

Tonight I will be joined by some of my colleagues on the Select Committee on Homeland Security and other Members who have played a leading role in homeland security issues in this House. We will discuss what we need to do to fight a smarter, a stronger, and a more effective war against terrorism. We will talk about the security gaps facing our Nation and our ideas for closing them.

We know that our terrorist enemies are not waiting. They continue to plot. They continue to scheme to attack America. We must have a sense of urgency, for the time to act is now; and we cannot wait any longer.

□ 2115

I am pleased to yield to the distinguished delegate from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), who has been a leader on the Select Committee on Homeland Security on the issues of bioterrorism and public health preparedness. Her background in the medical field has enabled her to have unique insights into what we need to be doing as a Nation to be better prepared to deal with the threats it faces.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for yielding, and I want to thank him for his leadership and for bringing us here this evening. I am

pleased to join him and other Members of our committee to call attention to the glaring deficiencies in homeland security, which continue to exist now more than 3 years after the attacks of 9/11, and the failures of the administration in this regard.

I do not call attention to them to cause alarm but to continue to put pressure on the administration and the Department to address what every commission or task force has told us even before that fateful day, and what polls show is the primary concern of Americans, our safety and the safety of our children, our protection from terrorism.

I am going to focus on the area of bioterrorism, and we can all agree that the threat of biological attack is a very real one.

Indeed, we have seen biologic agents used in this very building against our colleagues and those who work here. We also witnessed the differences in public health response here and in our neighboring communities, especially communities of color where several people died.

At committee meeting after committee meeting, we called the attention of this administration and the department to the fact that our public health system is inadequate in many areas; that the disparities in health care reflect this; and that many, especially in the private sector of medicine, are not trained or prepared to respond adequately in the case of an attack. Yet we still lag behind in these critical areas.

First of all, the health sector is not yet as fully incorporated as it should be in all areas of planning, and the development of systems that are important to the protection of our citizens.

Just this morning, we heard from Dr. Joseph Barbera of the George Washington University Institute for Crisis, Disaster and Risk Management, at a subcommittee hearing on the National Incident Management System, the very core of our response.

In his statement, the fact that he saw it necessary to stress to us that "medical care necessary for a mass casualty event must be recognized as a public safety function and therefore as a governmental responsibility that is equal in importance to fire suppression, emergency medical services, public works and law enforcement," the fact that he had to tell us, that speaks volumes about where this expert sees our state of readiness in this critical area. It is not where it should be.

I can tell my colleagues that in too many instances, health, both public and private, are not included. This while 62 percent of emergency rooms are over capacity and public health laboratories are reportedly operating at an average of 75 percent above capacity.

The funding that this administration has supplied to address these deficiencies is far below the estimated \$10 billion that is reportedly needed to

bring just the public health sector to where it needs to be. We have not begun to scratch the surface.

Another aspect of bioterrorism preparedness which this administration and the Department has failed to adequately address is the need to develop the capacity to rapidly diagnose and develop treatments for any agents that might be used.

In May, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and I introduced the Rapid Cures Act which would promote technological advancements to reduce the time frame from several years to a few months at the most for the development of new medical countermeasures to treat or prevent disease caused by not only agents of bioterrorism but disease agents or toxins that have the potential to plague our communities today.

SARS has shown us that we cannot know or predict what will be used. In that respect, Project Bioshield is not helpful. This bill gets to the heart of the matter and develops capacity that is more of the all-hazards approach that Governor Gilmore and many others have so strongly recommended.

We need to have protection and treatment against dangerous biological agents that might be used in an attack quickly, not in the 10 or 15 years it is now estimated to take. That bill has not even had a hearing yet.

Lastly, the administration has pretty much ignored the role of the public. They have not been brought into the discussion or development of the systems to the extent they need to be.

In every town meeting that I have had, I have heard critiques of what has been promulgated, and I have been asked how they can participate in developing the preparedness and the response. We ignore them at the potential peril of all of us.

One of the most important things that is needed in a disaster or any emergency is for people to follow instructions. If they do not, they put themselves and all of us at risk.

Just in the last few weeks, we saw people who clearly knew what their instructions were out in the ocean or not evacuating their homes, and that was in a relatively familiar disaster.

To date, most of the public are unclear about what they are to do in the case of the different forms of possible terrorism attacks.

On September 14, the New York Academy of Medicine's Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health along with the Joint Center for Economic and Political Study released a groundbreaking report entitled *Redefining Readiness: Terrorism Planning through the Eyes of the Public*.

The New York Academy of Sciences found that only two-fifths of the American people would follow instructions to get vaccinated in the event of a smallpox outbreak. In addition, it stated that only three-fifths of the American people would shelter in place for

as long as told in a dirty bomb explosion.

One reason for the lack of cooperation is that many people would be also worried about something other than what the planners are trying to protect them from. Three-fifths of the American people would have serious worries about the smallpox vaccine itself, and that is twice as many people as would be seriously worried about getting smallpox in the outbreak.

What we find in the case of the public is that the administration and the Department, as they have done too often in the case of first responders, have assumed that they knew what was best, or what was needed, instead of letting the people, in this case, speak for themselves, participate in the process of developing the strategies and the plan. On something this important, there must be a methodology in place to do this. Three years later, there is none.

First responders, all of them must be fully engaged in the process and so must the public.

This administration has spent too much time assembling a bureaucracy, one that does not even reflect the diversity of the country which it protects and too little time on putting the kinds of protections in place to be able to begin to claim the security high ground.

Two weeks ago, senators released a report card on this administration's progress in homeland security. While many other areas got a C to an F, bioterrorism actually got a B. The grade has to be much lower than that. Too much remains unaddressed. I would give them at best a C minus, and below average is not good enough for protecting us and our families. They have a lot more that needs to be done to ensure that we are as protected as we can be from a bioterrorism attack.

We know that there is no way to be 100 percent safe, but the White House has fought us, the Democrats particularly, on almost every step of the way to get to even where we are today. It has not provided the kind of leadership that is required, and it has certainly not lived up to its promises.

As a result, today, we are not as safe as we ought to be 3 years after that horrific wake-up call.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to be included in this special order. I thank him again for his leadership on the committee.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much. I thank her again for her leadership on this issue.

Next, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), another member of the House Select Committee on Homeland Security, a lady who has shown not only leadership on our committee on behalf of homeland security but great leadership on the House Committee on Ap-

propriations. She has also worked vigorously to protect her State from the threat of terrorism, the great State of New York. So it is a pleasure to yield to her.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Texas for his leadership on this committee. He worked so hard and helped us put together a really outstanding plan. It is unfortunate that because of various interactivities of the Republican leadership that we have not been able to take this plan to the finish line, but I personally want to thank him for his important contributions in helping us work towards a plan that would help keep America safe. So I thank him so very much for his important leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it really amazes me that more than 3 years after September 11, we are still talking about gaps in our Nation's strategy to protect against and prepare for another terrorist attack.

Several of my colleagues from the Select Committee on Homeland Security have already highlighted ways in which we can improve port and rail security; how can we better prepare public health communities to deal with a biological attack; and how to protect and secure our borders. We all agree that more needs to be done and must be done and that Congress should not go home without addressing each of these critical issues.

In my judgment, this administration and this Congress need to beef up their efforts to provide for first responders. Local police, firefighters, EMS technicians need information. They need training. They need the life-saving equipment necessary to protect them from the dangers they face every day.

I was appalled when I read in yesterday's New York Times that more than 120,000 hours of potentially valuable terrorism-related recordings had not yet been translated by linguists at the FBI. This is outrageous and particularly dangerous, especially for the residents of my home State of New York, which is referenced in intelligence reports time and time again.

How can we expect first responders to be able to adequately prepare for an attack when the Federal Government does not even have the capability to analyze and share with them the intelligence information it has collected? We can and we must do better.

As I travel throughout my district and speak with first responders, like Chief John Kapica from the town of Greenburgh, Chief Robert Breen from the town of New Castle, Chief Robert D'Angelo from the town of North Castle and all the other chiefs with whom I have been working closely, they all tell me that implementing an interoperable communications system is one of their highest priorities and that they have not received nearly enough guidance, support or resources to achieve this goal.

The 9/11 Commission report confirms that, despite the heroic efforts and experience of first responders, communications deficiency and lack of interoperable systems among police, firefighters and other rescue agencies hindered their response at the World Trade Center.

Eight years ago, let me repeat, 8 years ago, the final report of the Federal Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee concluded that, "unless immediate measures are taken to promote interoperability, public safety agencies will not be able to adequately discharge their obligation to protect life and property in a safe, efficient and cost-effective manner."

Now, forgive me if I sound impatient or even extraordinarily angry, but I am. With nearly every major study and report on homeland security concluding that lack of interoperability remains one of the most serious issues facing first responders in this country, I just simply cannot understand why this administration has done little more than pay lip service to the seriousness of this issue.

With estimates for implementing a nationwide interoperable communications infrastructure ranging anywhere from \$7 billion to \$18 billion, local governments and first-responder agencies cannot be expected to pick up the tab without significant help from the Federal Government.

Some of my colleagues may argue that current homeland security grants can be used to upgrade communications systems. While this may be true, the costs are so enormous, there simply is not enough money to go around. In my judgment, we are forcing our communities to make impossible decisions on how to use these funds.

□ 2130

That is why I joined with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), to introduce the CONNECT First Responders Act. This legislation establishes a Federal interoperability office and creates a new \$5 billion DHS grant program dedicated to helping States and localities achieve communications interoperability.

I understand that Secretary Tom Ridge recently announced the creation of an Office of Interoperability and Compatibility, with similar goals to the office that we propose in the legislation. I am pleased that the Department has taken this important step, and I am glad that our legislation may have encouraged those efforts.

We have learned the hard way that, at best, gaps in communications hamper rescue efforts; and at worst, they can lead to the loss of life for emergency personnel and victims. Our communities should not have to wait 2 years or 5 years from now until another disaster strikes to get the help they need to close this glaring and unnecessary gap in our Nation's security. Our first responders served us with honor and distinction on September 11 and

every day before and since, and they deserve better.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I want to once again thank my good colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and my other colleagues on the committee, as well as the staff for all their work in putting together a plan that really can win the war on terror.

We are, in America, at risk. As the mother of three and the grandmother of six, I worry every day about the future of my community and about the future of this great country of ours. We are talking about a complete overhaul of our intelligence system. Yes, they may be part of it, but there are specific actions that we can take right now. Shame on us if we do not move forward on the recommendations that can be implemented as we speak.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas again for his leadership.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her comments and her leadership.

Next, Madam Speaker, I wish to yield the floor to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a distinguished Member of this House who has worked diligently on our committee, who not only is a good legislator but a fine gentleman and is very committed to implementing the third prong of the war on terror as recommended by the 9/11 Commission, which is preventing the rise of future terrorism.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), for leading this Special Order. I especially want to recognize the work of the gentleman from Texas as our ranking member on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. Your colleagues and all Americans owe you a great debt of gratitude for your consistent valiant efforts to keep these critical issues at the forefront of the national debate.

Madam Speaker, there is no question about the importance of our efforts here at home to improve domestic security and preparedness, but I want to spend my time this evening addressing a topic that I think deserves equal attention, mainly the need for a full-scale global effort to enhance the image of America in the world and prevent the rise in recruitment of future terrorists. I think we often overlook this aspect of Homeland Security, perhaps because it is not as tangible, or the path is not as clear-cut, or perhaps because success is harder to measure. But we do so at our own peril and at the peril of countless future generations.

Dr. Joe Nye, the former dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard and former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, has talked about the need to supplement our military might with soft power, efforts to win the world's hearts

and minds with our values and culture. Successfully exercising this type of power requires that we pursue many fronts, including international diplomacy, democracy building, cultural exchanges, economic development, educational initiatives, and communication about our values and our ideals.

Now, most people do not give this strategy the attention it deserves, but I am pleased that the 9/11 Commission report recognized that soft power will be a critical component in our long-term efforts to stop the spread of Islamist terrorism.

It is easy to say that we were attacked on September 11 because the terrorists despise freedom and hate the American way of life, but the truth is much more complicated, and we do ourselves a disservice if we accept the simple answer.

To win the ideological battle being waged in the world today, we have to offer an alternative to the hopelessness and despair that the likes of Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda prey upon. Madam Speaker, there are millions of young people in the Islamic world who are hungry for hope and opportunity, and it is in our interest to show them that hope lies in freedom, liberty, and democracy, not in extremism and hate.

By pursuing policies abroad that promote voices of moderation, we can isolate the extremists and present a better vision of the future. By promoting democratic institutions, we can show that there is a better way, and we can offer a choice. By supporting economic development partnerships in the Arab world, we can help these nations become prosperous and self-sufficient. And by spearheading an international effort to offer educational alternatives to children in the Muslim world, we can provide the next generation with the tools to build a better future. These efforts will require significant resources, but the payoff will be immeasurable.

Perhaps most importantly, we must show the world what America and Americans truly stand for: tolerance, opportunity, hope, and freedom. And we must do it quickly, before an inaccurate image is indelibly emblazoned on the minds of millions. As the 9/11 Commission so eloquently put it, we need to defend our ideals abroad vigorously. If the U.S. does not act aggressively to define itself in the Islamic world, the extremists will gladly do the job for us.

Madam Speaker, in closing, let me again thank our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for bringing us to the floor this evening to discuss these critical issues. September 11 should have made clear to all of us that we do not have the luxury of time when it comes to addressing our security at home and abroad. I urge the President and his administration to exercise strong leadership and provide the necessary resources to ensure the safety of our citizens and our Nation.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Madam Speaker, next I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), a gentleman who is most active on behalf of the first responders across our country or those on the front lines in the war on terror. He is a gentleman who serves on our Democratic Task Force on Homeland Security, a gentleman who is most respected by all of his colleagues in this House, and who has served here for many years with distinction.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his efforts and for leading our intelligence task force in all the work we have been doing here under the gentleman's leadership on this issue, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who we will hear from next.

Having been in law enforcement for many years, and having founded the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus here, we are now looking at the third anniversary of September 11, and the question on many Americans' minds is: Are we safer? Is America safer today than we were on 9/11? The current administration says we are safer. The Republican leadership in Congress says we are safer. But just because they say we are safer, does not make it so.

For instance, when we are talking about our northern border, I come from Michigan and I border Canada. President Bush said on January 25, 2002, "We are analyzing every aspect of the border and making sure that the effort is seamless, the communication is real, that the law enforcement is strong." He also said on February 2, one week later, "We are focusing on the heroic efforts of those first-time responders. That's why we want to spend money to make sure the equipment is there, strategies are there, communications are there to make sure that you have whatever it takes to respond."

The Bush administration has mastered the rhetoric. They talk a great game about homeland security, but the numbers reveal a stark reality. Here are a few points: we are 2,000 border patrol officers short along the northern border with Canada, and the President's budget request fails to include additional funding to make these border patrol officers a reality.

Only 5 percent of passenger planes are screened for explosives, according to the GAO. And the President wants to cut the number of air marshals by 20 percent this year.

Our maritime security efforts are severely understaffed and underfunded, allowing us to screen only 5 percent of the nearly 8 million seaborne containers entering the U.S. each year, and \$7.5 billion is needed over the next 10 years in order to secure our ports and waterways. The Bush administra-

tion has distributed a mere \$441 million for this purpose.

This year's budget is the first time the Bush administration has ever asked for any port security grant money. Without the Bush administration's support, Congress has provided only \$587 million for port security since 2001. That is less than 10 percent of the money we need to do the job.

The President has cut overall funding for adequate protective gear and training for first responders. And this year is no different. He proposed more than a 20 percent cut in first responder training and State grants for training, equipment, and other homeland security needs. More than 40 percent of our Nation's firefighters have not received training for responding to nuclear, biological, or radiological attack.

Finally, national reports on the 9/11 emergency response found that the inability of our first responders from different agencies to talk to one another was a key factor in the deaths of at least 121 New York firefighters at the World Trade Center.

The independent 9/11 Commission report said "funding interoperable communications should be a Federal priority." Here is what they said, the 9/11 report says: "The inability to communicate was a critical element of the World Trade Center, Pentagon, and Somerset County, Pennsylvania, crash sites, where multiple agencies and multiple jurisdictions responded. The occurrence of this problem at three very different sites is strong evidence that compatible and adequate communications among public safety organizations at the State, local, and Federal levels remain an important problem. Federal funding for such interagency, interoperability as we call it, 'units should be given high priority.'"

Here is what the President said: "It is important that we understand in the first minutes and hours after attack. That is the most hopeful time to save life, and that is why we are focusing on the heroic efforts of those first-time responders. That is why we want to spend money to make sure equipment is there, strategies are there, communications are there to make sure you have whatever you need to respond."

Strong language from the 9/11 Commission; strong language from the President. The reality is what it costs to get interoperability going in this country 3 years later is \$18 billion. What has President Bush requested since 2003? He has requested \$100 million.

The President even has zeroed out these accounts in the Department of Homeland Security budget over the past 2 years. At the rate we are going, according to the Department of Homeland Security officials, it will be another 20 years before our Nation's first responders are interoperable, where they can talk to each other, communicate with each other. Madam Speaker, we do not have 20 years to wait.

Earlier this year, on this floor, I asked how much in the formula grants

provided for State homeland security has gone to interoperability. The Department of Homeland Security could not tell me. They committed to let Congress know the answer soon. We have recently found out that it is going to be about another year before we can even get an answer as to where the money has been spent, if it has been spent at all on interoperability. That does not say much about the oversight or planning in the Department of Homeland Security, and about where the billions of dollars of State grant formula money is going.

Madam Speaker, the problems I have outlined are occurring because of a lack of commitment on this administration to homeland security. Even the Department of Homeland Security still has not hired some 30 percent of the needed staff to properly run the agency. The homeland security challenges we face, whether it is border, airline, rail, or port security all require the same approach: real solutions instead of rhetoric, real resources and not political pronouncements.

Day after day we are told our Nation is better prepared against a terrorist attack than it was 3 years ago; but when only 4,000 Americans guard a border over 4,000 miles long, I cannot agree our Nation's northern border is secure. When our ports are not secured from the entry of a chemical, biological, or nuclear attack, I cannot take the word of anyone when they tell me my family and constituents are well protected.

□ 2145

And there is no comfort in the fact that our first responders are no closer now than they were after 9/11 to be able to talk to each other in times of natural disaster or terrorist attack. So how safe are we? The administration points to the toppling of Saddam Hussein. That does not make it. How does that make us safer when he was not an imminent threat, when there were no weapons of mass destruction, and we have diverted so much of our military and intelligence operations to Iraq. Osama bin Laden is still out there. Iraq is now a haven for new terrorist groups. Our country internationally is hated more than ever. We have alienated our allies, so exactly, how are we safer?

In the meantime, the current administration and the Republican Congress refuse to give our local, State and Federal agencies what they need to protect our borders and our communities. We will not even give them the equipment to talk to each other. On these issues, sure the present administration has mastered the rhetoric, but when looking at facts, we are dangerously behind in securing our borders to help prevent another attack or be ready when one comes.

As head of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, we are going to have a hearing next week on intra operability. There are technologies which

could be implemented today where police officers, State, local, and Federal, could talk to each other because of software developed by some of these companies. It is there. We should not have to wait more than 3 years after 9/11 for something as simple as allowing people to talk to each other. We hope we do not have another terrorist attack, but if we do, maybe we can tell those brave first responders, say, with the second building at the World Trade Center, the building is about ready to come down, get out. We could have saved 120 lives if we had the ability to communicate. Having been involved with law enforcement for over 30 years, it is time to look at reality. This administration is not doing the job. We are not safer at home than we were before, at, during or after 9/11.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for heading up our homeland security task force in our committee, and I look forward to working together in the future. Maybe together we can convince this Congress and the American people something as simple as first responders being able to talk to each other would save so many lives if we only had a commitment. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his leadership and for his conviction.

I think many of us are dismayed by the lack of preparedness 3 years after 9/11 at a time when our government tells us every day that we are faced with another terrorist threat, even estimating that we may be attacked between now and the election or between now and the end of the year. These are deadly, serious matters. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his leadership and for his hard work on behalf of first responders and on behalf of the security of our country.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield the floor to my friend, my fellow Texan, fellow member of the Committee on Homeland Security, from the great city of Houston, and I have seen the gentlewoman work on behalf of first responders in her great city. I have seen her talk to the many citizens who gather at her town meetings to discuss their concerns about security. I have seen her visit the port of Houston and the FBI office in Houston to talk about security. I know of her dedication and leadership, and it is a pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for gathering us today. In fact, let me add my accolades for the extensive work, the serious work that has been the defining track record of the gentleman's leadership as the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, and certainly, it has been, as the staff you have guided, as you have guided us as members of that committee.

Madam Speaker, there could not be more appropriate timing for this Special Order to speak to our colleagues, and certainly to bring attention to this very serious issue to the American people because, as the gentleman knows, many of us spent a good part of the day marking up legislation that pretends to be the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

I think that if the wisdom of the gentleman's staff and leadership could have been exercised in the process, we would have had a full, comprehensive legislative initiative that would have addressed the concerns of the 9/11 Commission, the 9/11 families, and also put together a fair package that would have responded to some of the needs that have been addressed. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and I would like to start by referring first of all to the document that was prepared, *Transforming the Southern Border, Providing Security and Prosperity in the Post-9/11 World*, done by the staff, mentioning the gentleman's leadership and that of the committee.

I would like to read directly out of it because this sets the tone for the remarks that I would like to make on the southern border, and I appreciate joining the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTENSEN) to talk about all of the issues, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) just mentioned the northern border, and I come to focus on the southern border, but I do so with the point that we have friends to the south. Mexico is a friend. Many Central American states are friends. South American states, our neighbors, are friends, and we speak about security in the context of friendship because I actually believe if we are going to be secure, it must be a collaborative effort.

Let me cite remarks on page 23: Infrastructure at the southern border ports of entry cannot effectively handle hundreds of millions of inspections annually. In addition, the southern border's infrastructure cannot support the implementation of new border security programs without harming the economies of border communities. There is a need to balance the competing tension between screening people and vehicles for terrorist weapons, contraband, smuggled immigrants and other prohibited items with the need to ensure an efficient flow of commerce.

Substantial investment in border infrastructure is needed to ensure national security while sustaining economic prosperity caused by increased cross-border trade over the last 10 years.

That is what we have been saying. The reason why these issues are so important is, we have not been able to balance the needs that are so very important, between free trade opportunities and the idea of security. There are 509 official ports of entry in the United

States, including land, airports and seaports. Of these, 166 are land ports of entry, 43 of which are located on the southern border. These southern border ports are equipped with 86 pedestrian lanes, 216 passenger vehicle lanes and 70 cargo lanes. These ports of entry are generally large facilities with high volumes of vehicular and commercial traffic.

This lays out just a photographic story of the kinds of challenges we have at the length of the border, the kinds of challenges we have at the border, and what we need of course is to have the skilled technocrats and law enforcement that the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol agents allow us to do. It is important to recognize in balancing these issues that we must do something. What have we done, in the committee that we are members of, we have done not as much as we should. Homeland security will not work if local communities are not consulted on border security policies, their cooperation is not sought, or if implementation of border security programs is not coordinated. Homeland security will not work if we are force-feeding border security policies as opposed to collaborating with the community.

I joined the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) to look at border control issues, and that was one of the main points addressed. That is to work with those local officials who live right on the border and let them tell us the kinds of concerns that they have. One was not only dealing with the lack of security measures there, in terms of the number of border patrol agents, but we also found out that there really is a need for changing policies and laws that allow some of those who have been detained to simply walk away because we do not have the legal procedures to hold them.

I want to make sure that all of the oversight issues are taken care of, such as making sure that there is judicial process; for these detainees to go through that process; making sure there are lawyers there to help with those processes and see that they are fair. But at the same time, we cannot have a secure border if we are allowing individuals to simply walk away because there is no place for them to be held. So more detainee facilities need to be there, adequately equipped, and the border patrol agents need to be well-trained.

The bottom line is that we must secure the borders by having the resources placed appropriately there. We also cannot ignore President Vicente Fox. Just 2 years ago, President Bush spoke about immigration reform and has done nothing to ensure that happening. That allows President Fox to talk about having the borders in the manner that he wants them in, and that certainly does not match the needs of this Nation. We must have collaboration, but we must have a fixed understanding of how we can continue



to have cooperation but not have the kind of systems that other nations want us to have.

First, international cooperation is critical, as I indicated, to an effective border security, and that means working with President Fox and Mexico to make sure what we have works for all of us. We must work with our neighbors to the north and south. Many of the border solutions require the cooperation by neighbors to effectively implement. Second, we must ensure that security at the border is delivered in a manner that enhances and enforces our priorities. The foundations on which our security programs are built, how they are implemented and how the borders are staffed, all of these factors must be taken into account, along with the security and economic interests of those living in the border region.

We have U.S. customs. As I watched them go through the many ports of entry, not enough staff. Technology, not enough technology at the borders. We have just been able to secure the opportunities for children to be detained in other facilities, but again, large numbers of unaccompanied children coming into the United States, no real resources to handle them. So we are finding ourselves caught between what is a rock and a hard place.

We need, again, as I have mentioned over and over again, additional technology. We need to have the kind of ability to survey the various trucks that are coming in, and so we need to be able to use the new technology to be able to survey trucks without actually going into the trucks. We have seen that kind of technology at our various seaports.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about doing something. That is what this Special Order has been. We are talking about the great needs of infrastructure. Let me also suggest that I hope this Special Order will argue for the continuation of the Committee on Homeland Security in the next Congress. The reason why we bring these matters to the attention of our colleagues is because we have heard over and over again from Secretary Ridge that he wants a focused authorizing body where he can address the concerns of homeland security in a fair and orderly way.

We have spoken about the ideas of first responders. We have talked about the need of medicine and emergency response, and the idea of dealing with the needs that will occur if there is a terrorist attack, and we have talked about intraoperability and then the question of border security. None of these issues have been fully addressed in the select committee because we have either not had the time or where-withal by the majority to follow through. It is crucial that this committee continues, but it is more crucial that we do things, and the way that we must do things to adequately ensure the security of this country is we must do it in a very bipartisan manner.

□ 2200

The number of legislative initiatives that the ranking member has helped us forge over the 2 years of the existence of this committee, I would hope that these items will find a place in the legislative history of this Congress. I hope they will be passed. I certainly hope the Secure Borders Act, which my colleague, Ranking Member Turner, introduced last week articulates a consensus approach to border security. I hope by some miracle that we might even pass it if not at the end of this session, in the lame duck that we are more than likely to have.

The idea is, Madam Speaker, that security is not a lonely task. It is a task that requires us to work together in an honest and open dialogue. It requires us to pay attention to the work that has already been done. Seven to 12 million illegal aliens enter into the United States. We can do this. We can make a difference. We can do this by passing border security legislation. We can do this by working with the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

My final point would be, we can do this recognizing we need complete immigration reform such that we deal with those illegal documents that are already here, by providing them earned access to legalization and family reunification. We can do that in a parallel track. I would only say, Madam Speaker, the question is why? Why have we not done this? Why have we not been able after the 9/11 tragedy to come together around concrete, effective, important legislative initiatives as offered by the ranking member and the Democrats on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. The question is why? The response should be if not now, then when? When are we going to address America's security needs? I hope that we will do it soon. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his time and effort.

SPECIAL ORDERS—BORDER SECURITY—MS. SHEILA JACKSON LEE  
INTRODUCTION

As a Representative from Texas—a border State—I am deeply concerned about the state of homeland security at our land borders. My constituents—the good people of Texas—and those in border States across America—understand better than anyone in Washington what our unique challenges are along the land borders.

Living in isolation has never been an option for us. We all know the cost of shutting down that border—political, economic, social and cultural. We are all united in wanting to keep our borders working—to make sure that legitimate travelers and cargo are not held up but that we do not let in those who would harm us.

When there is a threat to our country, it is our constituents and businesses that are on the front-lines. Whatever comes into our country—be it a crate of bananas or weapons of mass destruction, be it a tourist come to spend some money in Houston or a terrorist seeking to do us harm—our constituents feel it first.

In the aftermath of September 11th, we all agree that security is and always must be our Nation's highest priority. There is no balancing

act as some might suggest. Balancing involves competing interests and a give on all sides. We will and must not balance our Nation's security against competing interests. Rather, we must ensure that the border security solution that SECURES also serves to FACILITATE trade and travel.

Additionally, local and international buy in to border security solutions is critical if we want a system of border management that works. Homeland security will not work if local communities are not consulted on border security policies, if their cooperation is not sought, or if implementation of border security programs is not coordinated. Homeland security will not work if we are force feeding border security policies on the very communities that rely on the border for the economic livelihood.

The bottom line but the key to whether we successfully secure our borders is how we choose to go about doing it. It isn't just that we need to secure our country and our borders, but it's important how we deliver that security.

First, international cooperation is critical to effective border security. We must work with our neighbors to the north and south. Many of the border security solutions, such as US-VISIT, require the cooperation of our neighbors to effectively implement.

Second, we must ensure that security at the border is delivered in a manner that enhances and fosters other border and national priorities. How border security programs are designed, the foundations on which they are built, how they are implemented and how the borders are staffed—all of these factors must take into account the security and economic interests of those living in the border region. This is not about balancing competing interests, rather it means that the implementation of security at our borders must be done in a manner that fosters and enhances other border and national priorities.

Democrats believe that to secure our borders we must make a long term investment in our border communities.

We must make a substantial investment in infrastructure improvements at our ports of entry and to the transportation corridors that flow into those ports of entry. According to a report issued by the DHS's own Data Management Improvement Act Task Force, many approach highways and border inspection facilities were considered inadequate and overburdened prior to 9/11.

Additionally, with infrastructure expansion, we must add inspectors to our land ports of entry and ensure that they receive necessary training in foreign languages, fraudulent document detection and in interviewing techniques.

While technology is not a cure all, we must invest in technology that will both secure and facilitate the inspections process.

The Secure Borders Act which my colleagues and I introduced last week articulates a consensus approach to border security. While it was introduced by Democrats, it is a bill that everyone can and should support.

Lastly, what our Nation needs is a honest and open dialogue on comprehensive immigration reform—something Congress has been avoiding for years. As we invest in securing our borders, we must look at solving the issue of the estimated 7–12 million illegal aliens who call the U.S. home. After 9/11, having such a large number of people live in the shadows of society is even more unacceptable. We must review proposals that encourage these people to step forward. And we must at the same time enhance Federal enforcement of our immigration laws.

## SECTION SUMMARY—THE SECURE BORDERS ACT

The SECURE Border Act is designed to implement the recommendations of the report, *Transforming the Southern Border*, issued by Representative Jim Turner, the Ranking Member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security. The bill seeks to close the security gaps that exist on the Southern Border that were identified in the report.

## TITLE I—SECURING OUR BORDERS

## Subtitle A—Infrastructure Enhancements

*Sec. 101—Creation of a Land Border Infrastructure Improvement Fund*

This provision authorizes \$1 billion for an infrastructure investment fund to enhance and facilitate security and commerce at our nation's ports of entry. The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to carry out infrastructure improvement projects recommended in the report submitted under Section 102.

*Sec. 102—Requiring a Vulnerability Assessment of Land Border Ports of Entry*

This provision requires an assessment of and a report on the vulnerability of our nation's ports of entry to terrorist attack, the infrastructure and technology improvements needed based on the level of risk posed by vulnerabilities at the ports of entry, and follow up assessments every two years to monitor progress in securing ports of entry. Funds authorized in Section 101 should be distributed based on assessed priority.

*Sec. 103—Enhancing SENTRI, FAST and NEXUS Pre-Enrollment Programs*

This provision expresses the Sense of Congress that pre-enrollment programs should be expanded to every major port of entry, and authorizes pre-enrollment programs, the creation of pre-enrollment centers away from the border, funds necessary to build infrastructure to effectively access pre-enrollment lanes, funds to reduce participation fee in order to increase participation and creates an appeals process for those whose participation has been terminated. Additionally, the provision requires a report detailing the cost of the program as well as enrollment and enforcement information.

## Subtitle B—Enhancing Border Monitoring Technology

*Sec. 111—Deployment of Surveillance Systems Along the US-Mexico Border*

This provision requires the deployment of surveillance systems along the southern border, such as the integrated surveillance and intelligence system (ISIS), and ensure that the entire border is monitored 24/7.

*Sec. 112—Deployment of Surveillance Systems Along the US-Canada Border*

This provision requires that the development of a plan to deploy surveillance systems along the northern border and provide Congress with a cost estimate and deployment schedule by September 30, 2005.

*Sec. 113—Level of K-9 Units Working on the Southern Border*

This provision requires an increase in K-9 bomb detection units by 20%.

*Sec. 114—Deploy Radiation Portal Monitors*

This provision authorizes \$49 million to install radiation portal monitors at all land border ports of entry by September 30, 2005. Subtitle C—Ensuring Well Trained Personnel at Our Borders

*Sec. 121—Double the Number of CBP Personnel*

This provision authorizes the doubling of Customs and Border Protection personnel based on existing positions in FY 2004, and increasing the number of Border Patrol agents stationed between ports of entry by 3000 over FY 2005 and 2006.

*Sec. 122—Assessing Staffing Needs at Our Borders*

This provision requires DHS contract with an independent entity with human resource and staffing expertise to produce a study on staffing levels should be at ports of entry and between ports of entry in order for CBP to accomplish its border security mission. The study is due within one year of enactment.

*Sec. 123—Additional and Continuous Training for Inspectors*

This provision requires training for inspectors and where needed for associated support staff in new technologies. The section also requires that inspectors along the southern border be proficient in Spanish, and that appropriate language training be provided to inspectors and border patrol on the northern border. The provision also recommends the creation of a program to ensure the retention of customs and immigration expertise to supplement the One Face at the Border Initiative.

*Sec. 124—Requiring a Report on the One Face at the Border Initiative*

This provision requires the DHS to submit to Congress a report on the One Face at the Border initiative outlining the goals, strengths and weaknesses, and information relating to training and staffing. The GAO is required to provide Congress with an assessment of the report.

## Subtitle D—Establishing a Comprehensive Border Security Strategy

*Sec. 131—Border Security Strategy*

This provision requires the development of a comprehensive inter-agency national Land Border Security Strategy to identify and fix security gaps along the land borders of the United States. The strategy is to review a variety of issues related to land border security including personnel, infrastructure, technology, coordination of intelligence among agencies, legal responsibilities, criminal statutes, apprehension goals, prosecutorial guidelines, economic impact and the flow of commerce. The report is due on year after enactment and a GAO assessment is due fifteen months after enactment.

*Sec. 132—Improved Information Sharing*

This provision requires that IDENT, a two fingerprint database, and IAFIS, a ten fingerprint database, be made interoperable by October 1, 2005.

*Sec. 133—Creation of Northern and Southern Border Coordinators*

This provision creates northern and southern land border coordinator, appointed by the Secretary who serve as the primary official of the department responsible for coordinating federal security activities along the border.

*Sec. 134—Smart Border Accord Implementation*

This provision requires the President to submit to Congress quarterly updates on the progress of the Smart Border Accord Working Groups.

*Sec. 135—Sense of Congress on the Period of Admission for Border Crossing Card Holders*

This provision expresses the Sense of Congress that citizens and nationals of Mexico and Canada should be treated with parity in establishing the periods of time that they are in the US. The provision directs that once US-VISIT is fully implemented that the period of admission for Mexicans using a border crossing card should be increased to 6 months.

## Subtitle E—Enhancing Border Security Programs

*Sec. 141—Creating a More Effective Entry-Exit System*

This provision authorizes the creation of a US-VISIT Outreach Office to better inform

border communities about the implementation of US-VISIT, reauthorizes the creation of the Data Management Improvement Act Task Force to study issues related to border security, and requires that information currently collected by the I-94 arrival/departure form be collected by electronic means, namely US-VISIT.

*Sec. 142—Transportation Worker Identification Card*

This provision requires the submission of a report by December 31, 2004, on the development and distribution of the transportation worker identification card, including (1) information on how the card will be distributed, (2) the eligibility of Canadian and Mexican truck drivers who are certified under FAST, (3) selected biometric feature and (4) the cost and deployment schedule for card reading equipment.

*Sec. 143—Standards and Verification Procedures for Inter-modal Cargo Containers*

This provision requires that the DHS develop standards for container security 180 days after the enactment of this bill. It also requires the Department to develop a security verification process for container seals and evaluate container tracking technologies, cargo targeting data, and the inspection policy for empty containers.

*Sec. 144—Sense of Congress on the Need for Additional Staff for the US Consulate General in Mexico*

This provision expresses the Sense of Congress that the level of staffing for the US mission to Mexico has not kept pace with rising consular workloads and that a 25% increase in staff is necessary.

## Subtitle F—Securing Our Tribal and Federal Lands and Territories

*Sec. 151—Office of Tribal Security*

This provision creates an Office of Tribal Security to coordinate relations between the federal government and Indian tribes on issues relating to homeland security.

*Sec. 152—Transfer of "Shadow Wolves" from CBP to ICE*

This provision transfers the Shadow Wolves unit from Customs and Border Protection to Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

*Sec. 153—DHS and DOI Coordination on Border Security; Provision of Temporary Authority to DHS to Transfer Funds*

This provision provides the Secretary of Homeland Security with temporary authority to transfer funds from the DHS to the Department of the Interior to compensate the DOI for border security activities. The DHS and DOI are instructed to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement establishing (1) criteria for DOI to receive such funding, (2) priorities among projects, and (3) scope of activities for such projects. The DHS is required to report the transfer of funds to the appropriate congressional committees and a copy of the Memorandum of Agreement must be submitted to Congress. This provision will expire on the completion and implementation of the National Land Border Security Plan in Section 131.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas.

## THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes.